UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/675,380	09/29/2000	Peter Weber	5053-28301	1411

7590 08/30/2007

Eric B Meyertons
Conley Rose & Tayon PC
P O Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER	
COBANOGLU, DILEK B	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3626	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
08/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/675,380	WEBER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dilek B. Cobanoglu	3626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 May 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *68,69,71-77,79-87,90-92,95,96,98-104,106-114 and 117-119* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *68,69,71-77,79-87,90-92,95,96,98-104,106-114 and 117-119* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *See Continuation Sheet*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :01/08/02, 10/13/03, 10/17/03, 6/25/04, 2/16/05, 7/17/07.

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to the amendment received on 05/22/2007. Claims 68, 69, 71-77, 79-87, 90-92, 95, 96, 98-104, 106-114, 117-119 remain pending. Claims 68, 69, 71-77, 79-87, 90-92 and 95 have been amended. Claims 88, 89, 94, 94, 115 and 116 have been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 68, 69, 71-77, 79-87, 90-92, 95, 96, 98-104, and 106-114, 117-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeBlanc et al. (6,694,506) in view of Copeland et al. (5,946,694), Pree (Wolfgang Pree, Meta Patterns - A means for capturing the essentials of reusable object-oriented design, Proceedings, ECOOP'94, 1994 - info.uni-karlsruhe.de, accessed from google scholar, http://www.info.uni-karlsruhe.de/lehre/2004SS/swk/Papiere/ECOOP1994-Pree-Metapatterns.pdf), and McCormack et al. (6,049,773).

A. As per amended claim 68, LeBlanc discloses a computer readable medium comprising program instructions for developing a reinsurance administration

system for reinsurance contracts, wherein the program instructions are computer-executable to implement a method of:

i. obtaining a framework, wherein the framework comprises one or more classes of objects, a set of predefined, interconnected classes provided to create a set of objects and additional miscellaneous routines, which are all directed to performing commonly encountered tasks in a particular environment (reads on "a plurality of support processes" as described on page 30 of Applicant's specification), and a plurality of hooks or a plurality of subclasses that inherit all of the functions of the base classes and alternatively the subclasses can override some or all of its inherited functions (reads on "hook methods" as described on page 30 of Applicant's specification) (Fig. 2, col. 1 line 54 to col. 2 line 6, col. 2 lines 33-48, col. 3 line 46 to col. 5 line 10, c01.6 lines 10-60, col. 7 line 39 to col. 8 line 5) and a designated order for executing steps in one or more application programs, wherein the steps comprise pre-execution, data entry, data validation, pre-commission, commission and post-commission;

The amendment made to claim 68 repeats the same limitations of canceled claim 88 and 89. As explained in the previous office action, this method would be performed the same regardless of whether the method had a specific type of framework support process, support process, or reinsurance framework. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401,404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d

1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994). For further guidance, note MPEP § 2106, common situations involving nonfunctional descriptive material are: "a process that differs from the prior art only with respect to nonfunctional descriptive material that cannot alter how the process steps are to be performed to achieve the utility of the invention." It is noted that these support processes appear to be a piece of computer code. The support processes are never actually executed. Thus, the method in claim 68, in particular the last limitation is performed the same regardless of which support process is available, and thus the different types of support processes do not patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art.

ii. creating one or more subclasses from the framework classes, wherein the one or more subclasses inherit one or functions (reads on "hook methods") (col. 4 line 36 to col. 5 line 10);

iii. associating one or more of the classes provided to create a set of objects to perform tasks with subclasses (col. 4 line 22 to col. 5 line 5 line 10); and

iv. combining one or more subclasses to build one or more programs, wherein the order for executing steps in the one or more application programs is the order for the reinsurance business process framework (Abstract; col. 1 line 54 to col. 2 line 5 line 6, col. 2 lines 33-67, col. 4 line 36 to col. 5 line 10).

v. creating one or more reinsurance contract objects that represent one or more reinsurance contracts (Fig. 4, col. 2 lines 33-60, col. 3 line 46

to col. 4 line 21, col. 4 lines 36-47, col. 7 line 39 to col. 8 line 10, col. 9 lines 27-55), wherein creating a reinsurance contract object comprises:

(1) identifying one or more inheritable contract objects from the class of objects to represent one or more conditions of a reinsurance contract (Fig. 4, col. 2 lines 33-60, col. 3 line 46 to col. 4 line 21, col. 4 lines 36-47, col. 7 line 39 to col. 8 line 10, col. 9 lines 27-55), wherein the reinsurance contract object is a parent of a section object (col. 3 line 46 to col. 4 line 21, col. 4 lines 36-62),

(2) creating an instance of the inheritable contract object to identify a condition object, wherein the condition object is a child of the section object (Fig. 4, col. 2 lines 33-60, col. 3 line 46 to col. 4 line 21, col. 4 lines 36-47, col. 7 line 39 to col. 8 line 10, col. 9 lines 27-55); and

(3) configuring properties and methods of the condition object consistent with the reinsurance contract (col. 2 lines 7-15, col. 4 lines 4-21, col. 6 lines 30-60, col. 7 lines 39 to col. 8 lines 10, col. 8 lines 24-45).

As per the recitation of "overriding at least one of the hook methods of the reinsurance business process framework to access at least one stage in an execution of one of the reinsurance business processes and to identify a support process to be executed, wherein overriding the at least one hook method comprises overriding a method to be executed during data entry" LeBlanc discloses a subclass can override

some or all of its inherited functions or may modify some or all of its inherited functions by defining a new function with the same form (col. 4 lines 44-47). LeBlanc discloses that frameworks contain predefined classes which can be used as base classes and a developer may accept and incorporate some of the objects into these base classes or he may modify or override objects or combinations of objects in these base classes to extend the framework and create customized solutions in particular areas of expertise (col. 4 line 64 to col. 5 line 5).

LeBlanc fails to expressly disclose the feature of automatically generating process objects as defined by the combined process subclasses when one or more of the application programs are initiated. It is noted that this step is typically the final step in using an object-oriented software system.

Copeland discloses a class of objects such as an insurance policy, wherein when using the application program, a user can change the beneficiary of the insurance policy, determine the insurance policy premium, and any Other similar functions needed in the administration of an insurance company, wherein these classes of objects are defined by classes and parent classes (col. 4 lines 15-44, col. 6 lines 6-42, col. 7 lines 28-49).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the features of Copeland within the method of LeBlanc with the motivation of providing small, reusable sections of program code to reduce the costs and increase the speed of software development (Copeland; col. 1 lines 37-52).

LeBlanc and Copeland do not expressly disclose the concept of overriding a hook method in a framework to access at least one stage in an execution of one of the reinsurance business processes and to identify a support process to be executed. Pree discloses a framework using hook methods which represent the meta patters required to design frameworks consisting of single classes or groups of classes together with their interactions (page 4, section 4.1). Pree discloses subclass B1 overriding hook methods M20, wherein subclasses modify method implementations or add new methods (reads on "to access at least one stage in an execution of one of the reinsurance business processes and to identify a support process to be executed") (page 5 par. 2-3). A subclass that modifies method implementations or adds new methods must identify the method that is used and accesses a method that is used by the framework.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the features of Pree within the method taught collectively by Leblanc and Copeland with the motivation of providing a flexible framework that requires minimal adaptation effort (Pree; page 6 par. 7).

LeBlanc, Copeland, and Pree fail to expressly disclose a system pertaining to reinsurance including "wherein the reinsurance contract comprises the transfer by a first insurer of at least a portion of the risk associated with a primary insurance contract to a second insurer to provide protection to the first insurer against the risk associated with the primary insurance contract." McCormack discloses this form of reinsurance at col. 1, lines 41-64. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to include the features of McCormack within the method taught collectively by LeBlanc, Copeland, and Pree with the motivation of minimizing risk for the first insurer through reinsurance (McCormack; col. 1 lines 41-64).

The amended claim 68 also recites executing at least of the one or more application programs for the reinsurance administration system.

- The obviousness of modifying the teaching of LeBlanc to include executing at least of the one or more application programs for the reinsurance administration system (as taught by Copeland) is as addressed above and incorporated herein.

B. As per claims 69, LeBlanc discloses that a third property of object oriented programming is inheritance which allows program developers to reuse pre-existing programs. Inheritance allows a software developer to define classes and the objects, which are later created from them as related through a class hierarchy. Specifically, classes may be designated as subclasses of other base classes. A subclass "inherits" and has access to all of the public functions of its base classes as though these functions appeared in the subclass. Alternatively, a subclass can override some or all of its inherited functions or may modify some or all of its inherited functions by defining a new function with the same form (col. 4 lines 36-48). It is noted when the method allows a subclass to override some of the inherited functions from the base class, the base class is a form of abstract class.

C. As per claim 71, Pree discloses overriding the at least one hook method comprises replacing the hook method with one or more new methods (page 4 section 4.1, page 5 par. 2-3).

D. As per claims 72-77, LeBlanc discloses using hooks and Pree discloses overriding hook methods as discussed in claim 68. Copeland discloses that objects that perform system-related functions necessary for every method request, wherein the system- related activities include things like performing security checks, locking records, etc. that need to be performed before the business object performs its method (col. 7 lines 28-49). It is respectfully submitted that while LeBlanc, Copeland, and Pree do not disclose overriding every hook method as recited in claims 72-77, Copeland does disclose that they can be used before an object performs its method and Pree discloses that hook methods can be overridden. Further, the Examiner respectfully submits that it is well known in the art that a hook method can be used at any location in a routine or program and that they can be overridden. The motivation being for the purpose of debugging or enhancing functionality.

E. As per claims 79-87, 90-91, LeBlanc discloses that JAVA includes a wealth of frameworks intended to greatly enhance application software development on the internet (col. 6 lines 12-29). Further, LeBlanc discloses that JAVA beans are the object unit and are the tool which provide application developers with the framework for reusable, embeddable modular software components (col. 6 lines 30-43). Copeland discloses that objects that perform system-related functions

necessary for every method request, wherein the system-related activities include things like performing security checks (claim 86), locking records, etc. that need to be performed before the business object performs its method (col. 7 lines 28-49). The Examiner respectfully submits that the processes and frameworks recited in claims 79-87, 90-91 are well known in the art of object-oriented programming as disclosed by LeBlanc and Copeland. The motivation being to provide application developers with the framework for reusable, embeddable modular software components (col. 6 lines 30-43).

F. As per claim 92, LeBlanc discloses a memory medium and a transmission medium (Internet) (Abstract, col. 5 line 10-29).

G. Claims 95-96, 98-104, 106-114 and 117-119 repeat claims 68-69, 71-77, 79-87 and 90-92 as a method rather than as a carrier medium comprising program instructions, wherein the program instructions are computer-executable to implement a method. The underlying steps of the method have been shown to be disclosed by the collective teachings of LeBlanc and Copeland in the above rejections of claims 68-69, 71-77, 79-87 and 90-92. As such, these limitations are rejected for the same reasons given above for claims 68-69, 71-77, 79-87 and 90-92, and incorporated herein.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 05/22/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's amendments will be addressed below in the order in which they appear.

A. In response to Applicant's argument about neither Pree nor the other cited art teaches "overriding a method to be executed during data entry"; Examiner respectfully submits that LeBlanc discloses a subclass can override some or all of its inherited functions or may modify some or all of its inherited functions by defining a new function with the same form (col. 4 lines 44-47). LeBlanc discloses that frameworks contain predefined classes which can be used as base classes and a developer may accept and incorporate some of the objects into these base classes or he may modify or override objects or combinations of objects in these base classes to extend the framework and create customized solutions in particular areas of expertise (col. 4 line 64 to col. 5 line 5).
LeBlanc fails to expressly disclose the feature of automatically generating process objects as defined by the combined process subclasses when one or more of the application programs are initiated. It is noted that this step is typically the final step in using an object-oriented software system.
Copeland discloses a class of objects such as an insurance policy, wherein when using the application program, a user can change the beneficiary of the insurance policy, determine the insurance policy premium, and any Other similar functions needed in the administration of an insurance company, wherein these classes of objects are defined by classes and parent classes (col. 4 lines 15-44, col. 6 lines 6-42, col. 7 lines 28-49). The motivation is providing small, reusable sections of program code to reduce the costs and increase the speed of software development (Copeland; col. 1 lines 37-52).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

6. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dilek B. Cobanoglu whose telephone number is 571-272-8295. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

8. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 571-272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DBC
DBC
Art Unit 3626
08/15/2007

C. LUKE GILLIGAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600